arXiv:hep-th/0401143v1 21 Jan 2004

Relativistic Quantum Mechanics and Field Theory *

F. Strocchi
Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, Pisa, *Italy*

The problems which arise for a relativistic quantum mechanics are reviewed and critically examined in connection with the foundations of quantum field theory. The conflict between the quantum mechanical Hilbert space structure, the locality property and the gauge invariance encoded in the Gauss' law is discussed in connection with the various quantization choices for gauge fields.

KEY WORDS: relativistic quantum mechanics, quantization of gauge theories

1 INTRODUCTION

The problems of relativistic quantum mechanics (RQM) may look (at least partly) obsolete, but since the solution offered by quantum field theory (QFT) is now challenged by more radical ideas (like string theory and/or non commutative space time), it is perhaps worthwhile to critically reexamine the conceptual motivations for the birth of QFT. The difficulties of RQM which QFT is supposed to bypass are mentioned in almost any book on QFT, but in our opinion, in view of the latest developments, it may be useful to focus

---

[*] Invited lecture at the Conference "Problemi Attuali di Fisica Teorica", Sessione: Meccanica Quantistica ("Present Problems of Theoretical Physics", Session: Quantum Mechanics), IIASS "E.R. Caianiello", Vietri sul mare (SA), Italy, 11-16 April, 2003.

the basic properties which enter in the game and the role played by covariance, spectral condition (or stability), relativistic covariance and locality in forcing the transition from one particle (or few particles) Schroedinger QM to quantum fields.

Another conceptual reason for a reexamination of the foundational problems at the origin of QFT is that after more than seven decades no non trivial (even non realistic) model in four (space time) dimensions is under non perturbative control. Actually, the prototypic model of self interacting scalar field, which is used in most textbooks for developing (non trivial) perturbation theory, has been proved to be trivial (namely the renormalized coupling constant vanishes when the ultraviolet cutoff is removed) under general conditions, when treated non perturbatively [1]. This means that in general the perturbative expansion is not reliable and in general one cannot define a QFT model by its perturbative expansion.

It should be stressed that most of our wisdom in QFT is derived from the perturbative expansion and that it would be silly to neglect the extraordinary success of perturbative Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) in yielding theoretical predictions which agree with the experiments up to the eleventh significant figure. On the other hand, soon after the setting of perturbation theory, Dyson argued (2) that the perturbative expansion of QED cannot be summed and that big oscillations overwhelming the so successful lowest orders are expected to arise (typically at order $n = 1/\alpha = 137$).

These negative results legitimate the need of a non perturbative approach to the problem of combining quantum mechanics and relativity, with the aim of either validating the foundations of quantum field theory or displaying the need of radical changes and new ideas.[2]

It is a common belief that (non abelian) gauge theories provide the way out of the triviality theorems, but again a non perturbative control is lacking;

---

[1] For a review of the arguments on the triviality of φ^4 theories see Ref. 1.

[2] In the history of theoretical physics, there are famous examples in which the combination of different theories, with different origins, like e.g. electromagnetism and thermodynamics or electromagnetism and mechanics, turned out to be impossible without dramatic conceptual revolutions, like Planck energy quanta and special relativity.

moreover as we shall discuss below, such theories involve strongly delocalized (field) variables (typically those carrying a non zero charge), whose quantization requires either non regular representations of the canonical commutation relation relation (CCR) or a violation of positivity by their vacuum correlation functions. In both cases, the quantum mechanical interpretation of such variables is not standard.

2 QUANTUM MECHANICS AND RELATIVITY

Soon after the birth of quantum mechanics it became clear that in order to describe microscopic systems, like electrons, protons etc., at high energies one should combine quantum mechanics and relativity.

Both theories are very well sound and fully under control, in their domain of applications, also from a mathematical point of view; however, as we shall see, the combination of the two is a non trivial problem.

The basic requirements one has to fulfill are the following

(**QUANTUM MECHANICS**) **A Hilbert space structure** for the description of the (physical) states of the system, a **unitary dynamics** $U(t)$ and a **stability** condition, i.e. a Hamiltonian bounded below.

(**RELATIVITY**) **Relativistic covariance**, **relativistic spectral condition** $P^2 \geq 0,\ P_0 \geq 0$, and **locality** (or hyperbolic dynamics).

The implementability of time evolution by (a strongly continuous one parameter group of) unitary operators $U(t)$ is equivalent to the existence of the Hamiltonian (as a self adjoint operator); the relativistic spectral condition is actually required by the relativistic invariance of the property of energy positivity.

An hyperbolic dynamics is necessary for a finite propagation speed, as required by Einstein causality. Observable quantities should in fact be localizable (in bounded regions) and their time evolution should be contained in the corresponding causal shadow.

2.1 Relativistic Schroedinger Quantum Mechanics

Historically, the first attempts to combine quantum mechanics (QM) and relativity (R) went in the direction of writing a relativistic version of the Schroedinger equation (*relativistic wave equations*), and it was soon realized that serious problems emerge. In particular, it turned out to be impossible to satisfy basic physical properties, namely positivity of the energy, locality and non trivial interaction.

The simplest step is to replace the non relativistic energy-momentum dispersion law $E = \mathbf{p}^2/2m$ by the relativistic one $E = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2}$ and obtain the relativistic Schroedinger equation (for simplicity we chose units such that $\hbar = c = 1$)

$$i\partial_t \, \psi = \sqrt{-\Delta + m^2} \, \psi. \tag{2.1}$$

On the right hand side we have a pseudodifferential operator, whose mathematical meaning is that of acting as the multiplication operator $\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2}$ on the Fourier transform of ψ. Such an operator is non local and in fact it implies that even if the initial data is of compact support, it cannot remain so at later times.

Proposition 2.1 *Equation (2.1) does not have solutions of compact support.*

Proof. In fact, if $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is of compact support for $t \in [0, \varepsilon)$ so is its time derivative and the Fourier transforms of both, with respect to $\mathbf{x}$, are analytic functions of $\mathbf{p}$. Now, by eq.(2.1), $\partial_t \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{p}, t) = -i\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2} \, \tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{p}, t)$ and the discontinuity of the square root across the cut running from $-m^2$ to ∞ cannot be removed by multiplication by the analytic function $\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{p}, t)$.

The lack of locality of the time evolution is a serious drawback. First, localizability of the wave functions is strictly related to the possibility of implementing relativistic causality, namely the property that observable densities can be localized so that their support evolves in time with velocity less that $c = 1$. In particular, for solutions of eq.(2.1) the density $\psi(\mathbf{x})^* \psi(\mathbf{x})$ cannot be localized in this sense. The same localization problem arises for the current density $j_\mu(\mathbf{x}) = (j_0(\mathbf{x}),\, j_i(\mathbf{x}))$,

$$\begin{aligned} j_0(\mathbf{x}) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\,[\psi^*(\mathbf{x})\,(\sqrt{-\Delta + m^2}\psi)(\mathbf{x}) + (\sqrt{-\Delta + m^2}\psi^*)(\mathbf{x})\,\psi(\mathbf{x})], \\ j_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \tfrac{1}{2}i\,[\psi^*(\mathbf{x})\,\nabla_i\psi(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_i\psi^*(\mathbf{x})\,\psi(\mathbf{x})]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

If j_0 is of compact support at initial time, it does not remain so at any later time. [3]

Furthermore, the non locality of the free Hamiltonian makes very difficult to introduce the interaction, like the minimal coupling with an electromagnetic potential, since it is hard to give a simple meaning to the formal operator $\sqrt{(\mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}))^2 + m^2}$ (apart from the definition which requires the knowledge of the spectrum of the operator under square root).

A local time evolution is given by the Klein-Gordon equation

$$(\Box + m^2)\varphi(x) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

which is a hyperbolic equation and therefore preserves the localization of the initial data with a finite propagation speed. However, eq.(2.3) has solutions whose Fourier transform with respect to time has support unbounded below, i.e. the frequency ω may take arbitrarily large values with both signs $\omega = \pm\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}$; the negative sign violate the positive energy spectral condition. For solutions with negative frequencies also $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t) \equiv j_0(\mathbf{x}, t)$ becomes negative and there is no good candidate for a probability density. The solutions with negative frequencies must therefore be excluded by means of a supplementary condition. Since eq.(2.3) is of second order in the time derivative, the initial data involve both the value of φ and of its time derivative

---

[3] Moreover, if the form of j_0 is used to define the scalar product between two wave functions, the hermiticity of operators is not the same as in Schroedinger QM; in particular the multiplication by $\mathbf{x}$ is not hermitean and cannot describe the position operator. An hermitean position operator

$$\mathbf{x}^{op} \equiv \mathbf{x} - \tfrac{1}{2}\,\nabla(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}$$

can be introduced, but the maximum localization has a tail of exponential decay and such "localization" property is not stable under Lorentz transformations.

and the energy spectral condition requires that the initial data must satisfy the condition

$$i\,\partial_0\varphi(\mathbf{x},0) = \sqrt{-\Delta + m^2}\varphi(\mathbf{x},0). \tag{2.4}$$

However, by the previous argument this is a non local condition and therefore the initial data for solutions satisfying the positive energy spectral condition cannot have compact support. One is therefore facing the same localization problems of eq.(2.1).

An advantage with respect to the Schroedinger equation is that the minimal coupling electromagnetic interaction is described by local terms, namely by the following equation

$$D_\mu\, D^\mu\varphi(x) + m^2\varphi(x) = 0, \quad D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu(x). \tag{2.5}$$

There is however a serious problem, namely the positive energy condition is not stable under the interaction; in fact, quite generally, even if the initial data satisfy the positive energy condition, the Fourier transform of the corresponding solution may contain negative frequencies.[4] This phenomenon is known as the *Klein paradox* and represents a serious obstacle for the interpretation of $\varphi(\mathbf{x},t)$ as the wave function of a quantum particle.[5]

---

[4] For example, an interaction term $\mathcal{U}(x)\varphi(x)$, in the Klein-Gordon equation, with $\mathcal{U}(x)$ a potential of compact support in space and time, induces transitions to negative frequencies since the frequency spectrum of $\mathcal{U}$ is unbounded below.

[5] The analysis of the energy spectrum is conveniently done in the (equivalent) first order formulation, which in the free case reads

$$i\,\partial_t\, u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\Delta + m^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} u \equiv\; H_0\, u, \;\; u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by the scalar product

$$(u,\, v) = \tfrac{1}{2}\int d^3x\,[\nabla u_1 \nabla v_1 + m^2 u_1\, v_1 + u_2\, v_2].$$

Technically $u_1 \in H^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$, $u_2 \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)$; the Hamiltonian H_0 is selfadjoint on $D(H_0) = H^2(\mathbf{R}^3)\oplus H^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ and its spectrum is symmetric with respect to the origin. The interaction with external (tempered) fields, e.g. the minimal coupling electromagnetic interaction, corresponds to a bounded, in general non symmetric, perturbation.

In general the interaction with external fields having compact support in time does not commute with the projection operator P_+ which assures that the initial data (in the far past) satisfy eq.(2.4) and therefore transitions to negative energies are allowed.[6]

The roots of the above difficulties are rather deep being related to the impossibility of a non trivial time displacement of the support of the initial data (corresponding to a non trivial propagation speed) if the time evolution is described by an evolution equation with
i) *finite propagation speed (hyperboliticity)*
ii) *localization of the solutions (compact support in space)*
iii) *positive energy spectrum*

Proposition 2.2 *A time evolution with the above properties i)-iii) cannot induce a displacement of the support in space of the initial data.*

Proof. In fact, if R is a (compact) region in space disjoint from the support K of the initial data, then by hyperbolicity, for a sufficiently small interval of time I_t, the solution remains zero in R. Now, positivity of the energy spectrum implies that the solution has an analytic continuation to imaginary times and is analytic for $z = t - i\tau,\ \ t \in \mathbf{R},\ \ \tau > 0$

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t - i\tau) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int d\omega\, \tilde{\varphi}(\mathbf{x}, \omega)\, e^{-i\omega(t-i\tau)}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ denotes the Fourier transform of φ with respect to time. Thus, by Schwarz's reflection principle for analytic functions,

$$\varphi(f, t) \equiv \int d^3x\, f(\mathbf{x})\, \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0, \tag{2.7}$$

if $supp\, f \subseteq R,\ t \in I_t$ implies $\varphi(f, t) = 0$, for $\forall t$, i.e. $supp\, \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) \subseteq K, \forall t$.

One might think that the problems of the relativistic wave equations discussed above originate because time and space derivatives do not appear in a symmetric way and that the second time derivative gives rise to both negative frequencies and a non positive density $\rho(\mathbf{x})$. These seem to have been the motivations for the Dirac equation, which is linear in time and space derivatives at the expense of a four component wave function; in the free case it reads

---

[6] For a discussion of the external field problem see Ref. 3, in particular the contribution by R. Seiler.

$$[-i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu + m]\psi(x) = 0, \qquad (2.8)$$

where γ^μ, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ are 4×4 matrices satisfying $\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu = 2g^{\mu\nu}$, with $g^{\mu\nu}$ the Minkowski metric.

One of the advantages with respect to the Klein-Gordon equation is that the Dirac charge density $j_0(x) = \psi^*(x)\psi(x)$ is positive definite (with no condition) and can be interpreted as a probability density. Another important nice feature of the Dirac equation is that its time evolution is hyperbolic and that the initial data can be taken of compact support. This property persists for a large class of (local) interactions, including the electromagnetic minimal coupling in the physical radiation gauge.$^{(4)}$

However, as anticipated by the above Proposition 2.2, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian $H_0 = -i\alpha^i\partial_i + \gamma^0 m,\ \ \alpha^i \equiv \gamma^0\gamma^i$, is not positive and one faces the problem of eliminating the negative frequency solutions as before. Again one could use initial data satisfying a positive energy condition

$$P_+\psi = \psi, \quad P_+ = (-\Delta + m^2)^{-1/2}[\gamma^0\sqrt{-\Delta + m^2} - i\gamma^i\,\nabla_i + m], \qquad (2.9)$$

but i) such a projection operator is non local, so that the initial data satisfying the above condition cannot have compact support, ii) time dependent interactions, e.g. an electromagnetic interaction, induce transitions between positive and negative energy solutions, as for the Klein-Gordon equation discussed above (*Klein paradox* [7]). [8]

---

[7] See e.g. Ref. 5 and for a comprehensive treatment Ref. 6.

[8] Associated with the occurrence of negative energy solutions is the problematic interpretation of the coordinate $\mathbf{x}$ as the position operator; in fact its time derivative $\dot{x}_i(t)$ has eigenvalues ±1, corresponding (in our units) to the velocity of light (*Zitterbewegung*); moreover, even in the free case $\ddot{x}_i \neq 0$. Thus, as in the Klein-Gordon case, the position operator is obtained by taking projections on the positive energy subspace

$$\mathbf{x}^{op} = P_+ \mathbf{x}\, P_+,$$

To cure the negative energy problem, Dirac proposed his "hole theory", according to which all negative energy states are occupied and Pauli exclusion principle precludes any transition to them. Clearly, this step represents a radical departure from Schroedinger (few particle) quantum mechanics, since the actual picture involves both the Dirac wave function and the Dirac sea of occupied negative energy states, i.e. infinite degrees of freedom. Interactions can induce transition from a negative to a positive energy state, giving rise to holes in the Dirac sea, which will appear as particles of opposite charge; the net result of such transitions is creation of pairs consisting of a positive energy particle and a hole. It is not difficult to recognize in this bold Dirac idea the seeds of quantum field theory, where the field operators contain both positive and negative frequencies and the positive energy spectrum is a property of the states.

The difficulties of a one particle interpretation of relativistic wave equations discussed above indicate a conflict between relativity and Schroedinger (few particle) quantum mechanics. The net conclusion is that the one (or few) particle picture is unstable against interactions and that almost inevitably one has to admit the possibility of many particles excitations, i.e. a relativistic quantum mechanics must involve infinite degrees of freedom.

3 RELATIVISTIC PARTICLE INTERACTIONS AND QUANTUM MECHANICS

Another source of problems for a combination of Schroedinger quantum mechanics and relativity is their different description of particle interactions. In Schroedinger QM, the treatment of interaction between particles is based on the canonical (Hamiltonian) formalism and on the Newtonian concept of *force at a distance*, (typically described by an interaction potential), which makes use of simultaneity and therefore cannot be relativistically invariant. As a matter of fact, there are serious obstructions, even at the classical level,

---

with the inevitable delocalization problems discussed above.

for building up a relativistic dynamics involving forces at a distance. The natural concept of interaction compatible with relativity is that of contact force or more generally of local interaction with a dynamical medium or a field. One is then led to abandon the Newtonian picture of few particle interactions and consider the infinite degrees of freedom associated with the (dynamical) field responsible of the interaction.

3.1 Problems Of Relativistic Particle Interactions

A relativistic dynamics of particles in terms of distance forces meets the problem that interactions cannot be instantaneous (an inevitable delay resulting from the finite propagation speed) and that simultaneity is not a relativistically invariant concept (7). In fact, in the case of N particles of definite masses, if $x^{(i)}(\tau^{(i)})$, denotes the world line of the i-th particle, $\tau^{(i)}$ the corresponding proper time and $\dot{x}^{(i)}_\mu \equiv dx^{(i)}_\mu / d\tau^{(i)}$ the four velocity, Lorentz invariance implies $\dot{x}^{(i)}_\mu \, \dot{x}^{(i)\,\mu} = 1$. Hence, the stability of this condition under time evolution imposes the following constraint on the accelerations

$$\dot{x}^{(i)}_\mu \, \ddot{x}^{(i)\,\mu} = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

and therefore on the forces.

Now, a space-time translation invariant force at a distance on a particle depends on the relative positions (and possibly on the velocities) of the other particles at the same time, i.e. on the (free) Cauchy data at the given time, so that in general eq.(3.1) will not be satisfied. For example, as discussed by Wigner, (8) a space-time reflection invariant central force between the i, j pair of particles is of the form

$$F^{ij}_\mu = (x^{(i)}_\mu - x^{(j)}_\mu) f = -F^{ji}_\mu , \tag{3.2}$$

where f is a function of the invariants which can be constructed in terms of the four vectors x_μ and the four velocities; it is clear that in general the four vector $x^{(i)}_\mu - x^{(j)}_\mu$ will not be perpendicular to both tangents of the two world lines.

To cure this problem, van Dam and Wigner (9) proposed to use *non local* "forces at a distance", such that the force $F^{(ij)}$ on the i-th particle by the j-th particle depends on *all* the points of the trajectory of the j-th particle, which are spacelike with respect to $x^{(i)}$.[9] In this way, however, the dynamical problem is no longer formulated in terms of a Cauchy problem for differential equations and becomes almost untractable, since it involves the knowledge of part of the particle trajectories.

No interaction theorems for relativistic particle dynamics have also been proved within the canonical (Hamiltonian) formalisms, on which quantum mechanics crucially relies.(11) A substantial part for the proof of such results is the formalization of the property of relativistic invariance. A simple and natural translation of Poincaré invariance is that the ten generators of the Poincaré group (space-time translations and Lorentz transformations) are realized by functions of the canonical variables and that their Lie algebra is satisfied with the Lie product $[\, ,\,]$ given by Poisson brackets (12); if $H,\ P_i,\ J_i,\ K_i,\ i = 1, 2, 3$, denote the generators of time translations, space translations, space rotations and pure Lorentz transformations, respectively, they must satisfy

$$[H,\, P_i] = 0, \quad [H,\, J_i] = 0, \quad [H,\, K_i] = -P_i,$$

$$[P_i,\, P_k] = 0, \quad [\,P_i,\, J_k\,] = \varepsilon_{ikl} P_l, \ [\,P_i,\, K_k\,] = -\delta_{ik} H,$$

$$[\,J_i,\, J_k\,] = \varepsilon_{ikl} J_l, \ [\,J_i,\, K_k\,] = \varepsilon_{ikl} K_k, \ [\,K_i,\, K_k\,] = -\varepsilon_{ikl} J_l. \qquad (3.3)$$

Then one has [10]

Proposition 3.1 *If the particle coordinates (on the trajectories)* q_i^α, $\alpha = 1, 2, ...N$, *transform correctly under the Poincare' transformations, i.e.*

$$[\,q_i^\alpha,\, P_k\,] = \delta_{ik}, \quad [\,q_i^\alpha,\, J_k\,] = -\varepsilon_{ikl} q_l^\alpha, \quad [\,q_i^\alpha,\, K_k\,] = q_i^\alpha\,[\,q_k^\alpha,\, H\,], \qquad (3.4)$$

---

[9] Similarly, in Feynman and Wheeler theory of particle interactions the force $F^{(ij)}$ depends on the points of the j-th trajectory which lie on the light cone centered at $x^{(i)}$; with such a choice, the conservation laws of the particle energy momentum are not satisfied.

[10] H. Leutwyler, loc. cit.

(world line conditions) and the equations of motions are not degenerate, i.e.

$$det \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i^\alpha \, \partial p_k^\beta} \neq 0, \tag{3.5}$$

then the particle accelerations vanish

$$[\,[\,q_i^\alpha,\, H],\, H\,] = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Remark The non degeneracy condition states that the positions and velocities form a complete set of dynamical variables, so that the transition to a Lagrangian is possible in the standard way. The above equations (3.4) for the transformation properties of the coordinates correspond to the world-line condition of Currie et al. [11].

As discussed by Ekstein (13) the point at the basis of the argument is that in the relativistic case the Hamiltonian can be obtained from the Lie product of $[\,P_i,\, K_i\,]$ and therefore if space translations and boosts have a kinematical character, i.e. can be written as sums of single particle functions, so is also the Hamiltonian and there cannot be any particle interaction. Such a constraint does not exists in the non relativistic case, where the non vanishing Lie products of the generators of the Galilei group are $[\,G_i,\, H\,] = P_i$, $[\,P_i,\, G_k\,] = m\delta_{i\,k}$ and those which state the vector character of P_k, J_k, and G_k (the generators of the accelerations) and . As it is well known, such Lie products are compatible with a non trivial particle interaction.

---

[11] For a simple derivation see the review by Currie and Jordan pp. 93-94. We briefly sketch the argument. Let $X_i \equiv q_i(t)$, $X_i' \equiv q_i'(t')$ denote the coordinates of particle position on the trajectory at time t and the corresponding ones in a Lorentz transformed frame. We put $t' = 0$ and consider an infinitesimal transformation so that second order terms in the Lorentz boost parameter α_j are neglected. Then one has

$$X_i = X_i' - \alpha_j t' = X_i', \;\; t = t' - \alpha_j X_j' = -\alpha_j\, X_j',$$

$$X_i = q_i(t = -\alpha_j X_j') = q_i(0) - \alpha_j X_j'\, v_i = q_i(0) - \alpha_j q_j(0)\, v_i, \;\; v_i \equiv dq_i(t)/dt|_{t=0},$$

$$\alpha_j [q_i,\, K_j\,] = \delta^{\alpha_j} q_i(t) = -(q_i'(0) - q_i(0)) = -\alpha_j q_j(0) v_i.$$

3.2 Field Interactions And Quantum Mechanics

The difficulties pointed out above for interactions described by distance forces suggest to consider contact forces or more interestingly field mediated interactions, with a field contact action on the particles. In this case, the interaction is a result of energy momentum exchanges between the particles through the field, which propagates energy and momentum and can transfer them to the particles by contact. Lorentz covariance is then transcribed in the Lorentz invariance of the field equations. This appears therefore as the distinguished (if not the exclusive) way of formulating relativistic particle interactions and indeed the electromagnetic interaction is the prototypical example.

When such a picture is confronted with quantum mechanics, interesting considerations emerge, as clearly emphasized by Heisenberg (14). If the classical particles are promoted to Schroedinger particles, according to the principles of quantum mechanics, the question arises about the quantum mechanical status of the interaction mediating field. The possibility of keeping a classical structure for the fields is ruled out by Heisenberg uncertainty relations.

The point in Heisenberg argument is that if the measurement of field momentum and its localization were not constrained by quantum mechanical limitations, one could use the particle-field interaction to violate the Heisenberg uncertainty relations for the measurement of the particle position and momentum.

A relativistic description of particle interactions mediated by a local action of fields on the particles poses the problem of the field dynamics, which, as argued before, should be described by *local relativistic field equations.* We have already seen such equations in Sect. 2, albeit with different motivations, and one would run into the same problems discussed before if the fields are interpreted as Schroedinger wave functions. In particular, positive energy spectrum would exclude localizability of the field. Again a departure from Schroedinger quantum mechanics in the direction of field quantization offers a solution of such a problem. In fact, the classical expression of the field energy, e.g. in the free case,

$$H(\varphi) = \tfrac{1}{2} \int d^3x \, [\nabla\varphi^* \, \nabla\varphi + m^2 \varphi^* \, \varphi + \dot{\varphi}^* \, \dot{\varphi}\,] \qquad (3.7)$$

is positive definite and, in the canonical formulation, the Poisson brackets of $H(\varphi)$ give the time derivatives of the canonical field

$$\partial_t \, \varphi = -\{H(\varphi), \, \varphi\,\}. \qquad (3.8)$$

Thus, one recovers the rôle of $H(\varphi)$ as the *positive* quantum generator of time translations, provided the field is considered as a quantum operator (*field quantization*) and the Poisson brackets are replaced by commutators, as in the canonical quantization procedure of classical theories. In this way, *positivity of the energy* is obtained. Furthermore, with the promotion of the field from Schreodinger wave function to a quantum operator, the frequency spectral support of (the Fourier transform of) the field operator does not describe the energy-momentum of a state (as it would be the case for a wave function) but rather the energy-momentum *variations* that the field operator may induce by its application on a state, so that it is not constrained to lie in the forward cone $\bar{V}_+$ by the spectral condition on the energy momentum operator. Then, a *local field dynamics* is allowed.

In this picture, also the problems connected with the non positive definiteness of $j_0(x,t)$ disappear, since j_0 has the meaning of charge density operator, whereas the probability density, say for a one particle state Ψ, is given by the modulus squared of its (c-number) wave function $\Psi(\mathbf{x}, t)$, which is related to (suitable) matrix elements of the quantum field operator $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

As it is well known and it is instructive to check in the above perspective, all this works very well in the free case. In conclusion, the problems of local relativistic equations of motion and positive energy spectrum are solved in the following way: i) the local field equations allow for both positive and negative frequencies and in fact the field has support in both the upper and lower hyperboloids $p^2 = m^2$, ii) the Hamiltonian operator is a positive operator and therefore its spectrum is positive, iii) the negative frequency part of the field, say φ^-, is an operator whose action on a state lowers its energy; the positivity of the energy spectrum then requires that there is a lowest energy energy state (vacuum state) which is annihilated by φ^-.

All this strongly suggests that relativistic particle interactions are accounted for by the absorption or emission of energy momentum quanta carried by the interaction mediating field. The question of whether such an idea leads to a mathematically consistent theory of particle interactions is the fundamental problem raised in the Introduction.

3.3 General Properties Of Quantum Field Theory

The investigation of the non perturbative foundations of relativistic quantum field theory began soon after the success of the perturbative expansion of quantum electrodynamics, when the convergence of the series was seriously questioned, the theory was predicted to be afflicted by ghosts (15) and the high energy behaviour seemed to indicate the inconsistency of the theory.

Furthermore, the mathematical problems of the interaction picture codified by Haag theorem and by Powers and Baumann theorems on the impossibility of using canonical quantization for the quantization of interacting fields, indicate that a non perturbative foundation of quantum field theory is an unavoidable issue.

The two major steps in this direction were the Wightman formulation of quantum field theory in terms of the so called Wightman "axioms", (16) which emphasize the spectral condition, relativistic invariance and locality, and the Lehmann, Symanzik and Zimmermann approach (LSZ "axioms") (17) based on the asymptotic condition and the S-matrix elements. We shall briefly discuss the first approach, which proved to be more powerful, the second being derivable from it (18) . The term "axioms", even if correctly stressing the attention to the mathematical rigor and consistency, does not do justice to the fact that in both cases they represent the mathematical formulation of deep and simple physical requirements.

The quantum mechanical interpretation of the theory and stability are encoded in the following **quantum mechanical properties**

QM1. (**Hilbert space structure**) The states are described by vectors of a (separable) Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$

QM2. (**Energy-momentum spectral condition**) The space-time translations are a symmetry of the theory and are therefore described by strongly continuous unitary operators $U(a)$, $a \in \mathbf{R}^4$, in $\mathcal{H}$.

The spectrum of the generators P_μ is contained in the closed *forward cone* $\bar{V}_+ = \{p_\mu : p^2 \geq 0,\, p_0 \geq 0\}$. There is a *vacuum state* Ψ_0, with the property of being the unique translationally invariant state, (hereafter referred to as *uniqueness of the vacuum*).

QM3. (**Field operators**) The theory is formulated in terms of fields $\varphi_k(x)$, $k = 1, ...N$, which are operator valued tempered distributions in $\mathcal{H}$, with Ψ_0 a *cyclic* vector for the fields, i.e. by applying polynomials of the (smeared) fields to the vacuum one gets a dense set $\mathcal{D}_0$.

Remarks. The separability of $\mathcal{H}$ actually follows from the cyclicity of the vacuum and temperedness, since $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^4)$ has a countable basis [12].

The cyclicity of the vacuum states that the fields provide a complete set of "dynamical variables" in terms of which, by application to the vacuum, one can describe all the states of $\mathcal{H}$.

The relativistic invariance of the theory is formalized by the following **relativistic properties**:

R1. (**Relativistic covariance**) The Lorentz transformations Λ are described by (strongly continuous) unitary operators $U(\Lambda(A))$, $A \in SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ = the universal covering group [13] of the restricted Lorentz group $L_+^\uparrow$ (characterized by $det\, \Lambda = 1$, $sign\, \Lambda^0_0 > 0$) and the fields transform covariantly under the Poincaré transformations $U(a,\, \Lambda) = U(a)\, U(\Lambda)$:

$$U(a, \Lambda(A))\, \varphi_i(x)\, U(a, \Lambda(A))^{-1} = S_{i\,j}(A^{-1})\, \varphi_j(\Lambda x + a), \qquad (3.9)$$

---

[12] Both the test function spaces $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are separable as topological spaces

[13] This accounts for the spinor representations; for simplicity, in the following the "label" A in $\Lambda(A)$ will not be always spelled out.

with S a finite dimensional representation of $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$.

R2. (**Microcausality or locality**) The fields either commute or anticommute at spacelike separated points

$$[\,\varphi_i(x),\, \varphi_j(y)\,]_{\mp} = 0, \;\; \text{for} \;\; (x-y)^2 < 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Remarks. Eq. (3.9) guarantees the manifest covariance of the formulation, but is not strictly implied by relativistic invariance, since one could use non covariant fields; in this sense it is an essentially technical condition, since it is clearly more convenient to use dynamical variables with simple transformation properties under the symmetries of the theory.

It is easy to see that eq.(3.10) holds for free fields; in the interacting case its validity for observable fields, like e.g. the electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu}(x)$, is required by Einstein causality, by which measurements of observables localized in spacelike separated regions must be always compatible (in the quantum mechanical sense) and therefore such observables must commute. The validity of eq.(3.10) for unobservable fields, like e.g. the fermion fields (or fields carrying a gauge charge), is an extrapolation with respect to the physical requirements, on the basis of the free case and should be considered as an essentially technical requirement, like the field manifest covariance. The main motivation is that it guarantees that the observable operators constructed in terms of unobservable local fields, like e.g. the current density, the momentum density etc., automatically commute at spacelike separated points, i.e. satisfy Einstein causality. It is also fair to say that most of our present wisdom on QFT, including the full control of the low dimensional cases, comes from models formulated in terms of local (in general unobservable) fields.

An alternative approach is to use only (bounded) local observables; in this case not all the physical states belong to the vacuum representation of the observable algebra and unobservable fields may possibly be constructed as intertwiners between inequivalent representations of the observable algebra (19) . This approach, also called algebraic quantum field theory, is more economical from a conceptual point of view, but less practical for the constructive problem of quantum field theory models. One of the main virtues of Wightman approach is its strong link with the conventional wisdom of quantum field theory, including the perturbation theory, which crucially relies on the use of non observable fields, like the vector potential and the electron field in QED. For this reason, the investigation of the mathematical structures of the vacuum expectation values of fields, which are at the basis of Wightman approach, has a direct impact on the conventional formulation.

The properties QM1-QM3, R1, R2 imply the following properties of the vacuum expectation values (*Wightman functions*) of, e.g., a scalar field. As a consequence of QM3

W1. $\mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_n) \equiv (\Psi_0, \varphi(x_1)...\varphi(x_n)\,\Psi_0)$ are tempered distributions.

In the following for brevity we shall use a multivector notation $\mathcal{W}(x) = \mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_n)$, $x = (x_1, ...x_n)$.

As a consequence of QM2 and R1, putting $\xi_j \equiv x_{j+1} - x_j$, one has

W2. (**Covariance**)

$$\mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_n) = W(\xi_1, ...\xi_{n-1}) \equiv W(\xi) = W(\Lambda\xi). \tag{3.11}$$

W3. (**Spectral condition**) The support of the Fourier transform $\tilde{W}$ of W is contained in the product of forward cones, i.e.

$$\tilde{W}(q_1, ...q_n) = 0, \quad \text{if} \;\; q_j \notin \overline{V}_+. \tag{3.12}$$

W4. (**Locality**) R2 gives

$$\mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_j, x_{j+1}, ...x_n) = \mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_{j+1}, x_j, ...x_n), \quad \text{if} \;\; (x_j - x_{j+1})^2 < 0. \tag{3.13}$$

The Hilbert space structure of QM1 gives

W5. (**Positivity**) For any terminating sequence $\underline{f} = (f_0, f_1, ...f_N)$, $f_j \in$

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^4)^j$ one has [14]

$$\sum_{j,k} \int dx\, dy\, \bar{f}_j(x_j, ...x_1)\, f_k(y_1, ...y_k)\, \mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_j; y_1, ...y_k))\, \geq 0. \qquad (3.14)$$

The uniqueness of the translationally invariant state is equivalent to

W6. (**Cluster property**) For any spacelike vector a and for $\lambda \to \infty$

$$\mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_j, x_{j+1} + \lambda a, ...x_n + \lambda a) \to \mathcal{W}(x_1, ...x_j)\, \mathcal{W}(x_{j+1}, ...x_n), \qquad (3.15)$$

(the convergence being in the distributional sense).

Eq.(3.15) says that the correlation function of two monomials of (smeared) fields, called clusters, factorizes in the limit of infinite spacelike distance between the two clusters. This property plays a crucial rôle for the existence of asymptotic (free) fields and therefore for the construction of the S-matrix, as clarified by the Haag-Ruelle theory (20). It corresponds to a sufficient fall off of the potential in potential scattering and it is one of the basic axioms of the so-called S-matrix theory (21). Property (3.15) is related to the independence of events associated to two clusters, when their separation becomes infinite in a spacelike direction; the rate by which the limit is reached in eq.(3.15) has actually been related to the decay rate of the "force" between the two clusters (22)

From the general physical requirements, transcribed in the mathematical properties W1-W6, a number of relevant structural information have been derived, some of them having direct experimental consequences.

The first point is that the conditions W1-W6 provide a more general quantization rule than canonical quantization. Actually, in the case of a field obeying a free field equation, W1-W6 imply canonical quantization as a result of Jost-Schroer theorem, [15] whereas for a general class of interacting fields,

---

[14] This is the transcription of positivity of the norm of any state of the form

$$\Psi_{\underline{f}} = f_0 \Psi_0 + \varphi(f_1)\, \Psi_0 + \varphi(f_2^{(1)})\, \varphi(f_2^{(2)}) \Psi_0 + ...,$$

where $\underline{f} = (f_0, f_1, ...f_N)$, $f_j = \prod_{k=1}^{j} f_j^{(k)}(x_k)$.

[15] R.F. Streater and A.S. Wightman, loc. cit. Theor.4-15.

as proved by Powers and Baumann, W1-W6 exclude canonical quantization and provide a (non perturbative) substitute for it.

Another important consequence of W1-W6 is the existence of asymptotic fields and, under the assumption of asymptotic completeness, of a unitary S-matrix. Also the LSZ asymptotic condition and the associated reduction formulas can be derived from the Wightman formulation, as proved by Hepp (see his Brandeis lectures); furthermore one can prove dispersion relations for scattering amplitudes, yielding experimentally measurable relations (23).

By exploiting the analyticity properties of the Wightman functions, a proof of Pauli principle has been obtained, namely that in the alternative of commutation or anticommutation relations at spacelike points, fields carrying (half)integer spin must (anti)commute (this is the famous Spin Statistic Theorem).

The validity of the PCT symmetry, (up to now an experimentally established property) also follows from the general properties of the Wightman functions, being in particular related to local commutativity (see the Streater and Wightman book).

Finally, by exploiting the spectral condition, the Lorentz covariance and locality, it has been shown that the Wightman functions have an analytic continuation to the so called euclidean points and therefore in this way one derives the existence and the general properties of euclidean quantum field theory, a crucial technical tool for the non perturbative approaches developed in the last decades (like the lattice approach to gauge theories, the constructive strategy etc.).

Unfortunately, the physically motivated constraints W1-W6 are highly non trivial to satisfy, as indicated by the non perturbative results on the triviality of the $\lambda\varphi^4$ theory and possibly of quantum electrodynamics. It may be instructive to note that the $\lambda\,\varphi^4$ theory in four space time dimensions would no longer be trivial if either the Hilbert space structure (i.e. positivity) or the spectral condition ($\lambda > 0$) is relaxed (24).

4 QUANTUM GAUGE FIELD THEORY

A widespread belief is that the above mentioned triviality problems do not exist for asymptotically free QFT's and in particular for a large class of non abelian gauge theories. Thus, at present, gauge field theory appears as the good candidate for the solution of the problem of combining quantum mechanics and relativity.

Unfortunately, in gauge theories the (positive Hilbert space) quantization of charged fields requires their strong delocalization, so that locality, eq.(3.10), fails. Since all the wisdom gained from perturbation theory crucially relies on the use of local fields and very little is known about non local field theories, a relevant mathematical question is which are the alternatives and what can be learned from the perturbative approach about the general structures. This is the content of the present section.

From the standard perturbative treatment of gauge theories one may be led to believe that the differences with respect to the ordinary QFT models, like $\lambda\varphi^4$, are merely technical and essentially amount to more complicated bookkeeping rules and to a proliferation of indices. In fact, in quantum field theory textbooks, the perturbative expansion of QED in the Feynman gauge is discussed in strict analogy with the scalar field theory model.

In effect, even from a physical point of view, gauge field theories are characterized by radically different structures with respect to ordinary QFT's and such differences are responsible for the new problems which arise in the quantization of gauge theories.

The basic difference is the invariance under the infinite dimensional Lie group $\mathcal{G}$ of (local) gauge transformations, so that by the second Noether theorem one not only deduces the existence of a conserved current j^α_μ, for each generator of the subgroup G of rigid (or global) gauge transformations, but also the fact that such a current is the divergence of an antisymmetric tensor (in the language of differential geometry the associated form is a boundary)

$$j^\alpha_\mu = \partial^\nu G^\alpha_{\nu\,\mu}, \;\; G^\alpha_{\nu\,\mu} = -G^\alpha_{\mu\,\nu}, \tag{4.1}$$

$\alpha = 1, ...N$, $N = dim\, G$. Such a property will be called (local) **Gauss law**. It plays a rather crucial role for understanding the structural differences with respect to ordinary QFT's , since most of the peculiar phenomena exhibited by gauge field theories, like Higgs mechanism, linearly raising quark-anti quark potential, quark confinement, charged field delocalization etc. depend on it.

We briefly mention some of its important consequences [16]. First, current conservation becomes a geometrical identity which does not involve the evolution equations of the charge carrying fields. Secondly, the Gauss' law implies the superselection of the charge associated to the current j^α_μ, formally

$$Q^\alpha = \int d^3x\, j^\alpha_0(\mathbf{x}, t), \tag{4.2}$$

i.e. one not only has a selection rule associated to the conservation law $[\, Q^\alpha,\, H\,] = 0$, with H the Hamiltonian, but the much stronger property that $[\, Q^\alpha,\, A\,]$, for *any* (local) observable (26) .

Finally, the Gauss' law implies the non locality of the charged fields (27), since, e.g. in the abelian case, a field φ has a charge q if

$$[\, Q,\, \varphi\,] = q\varphi, \tag{4.3}$$

and by Gauss' law one has

$$[\, Q,\, \varphi(y)\,] = \int d^3x\, [\, j_0(\mathbf{x}, 0),\, \varphi(y)\,] = [\, \Phi_\infty(\mathbf{E}),\, \varphi(y)\,], \tag{4.4}$$

where $\Phi_\infty(\mathbf{E})$ denotes the flux at spacelike infinity of the electric field $E_i \equiv G_{0\,i}$. Clearly, if $\varphi(y)$ and $E_i(x)$ commute at spacelike separations, the right hand side vanishes (since the spacelike infinity is spacelike with respect to any spacetime point y) and $\varphi(y)$ cannot have a non zero charge Q. The physical meaning of such a property is rather transparent, being related to Gauss' theorem; the local Gauss' law implies long range correlations and a Coulomb like delocalization to ensure a non vanishing electric flux at infinity.

---

[16] For a look to gauge theories which emphasizes the local Gauss law, see Refs. 25.

In the standard perturbative approach, e.g. in the so called covariant and renormalizable gauges, the non locality implied by Gauss' law is somewhat hidden by the choice of weakening the requirement of gauge invariance and by requiring the Gauss' law only on a subspace of the vector space of the corresponding quantum field theory (see below). This choice leads to the violation of positivity by the correlation functions of the charged fields.

In conclusion, quite generally one can prove that in the quantization of gauge field theories the (correlation functions of the) charged fields cannot satisfy all the quantum mechanical constraints QM1, QM2 and the relativity constraints R1, R2, since locality and positivity are crucially in conflict (28). Therefore, the general framework discussed in Sect.3.3 has to be modified (*modified Wightman axioms*).

4.1 Quantum Mechanics And Gauss' Law

To better grasp the structural problems arising in the quantization of gauge theories the following brief digression about charged states may be of help.

In standard **QFT models with no superselection rule**, i.e. with no quantum number commuting with all the observables, the vacuum is a cyclic vector for the (local) observable field algebra $\mathcal{A}$, in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, which contains all the physical states (which can be associated to such a vacuum state).

In general, a **gauge QFT** is characterized by the existence of quantum numbers Q^α, called "charges", which commute with all the observables; the observable (local) field algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a proper subalgebra of a field algebra $\mathcal{F}$ and relevant particle representations of $\mathcal{A}$, defined by "charged states", are disjoint from the vacuum sector

$$\mathcal{H}_0 \equiv \overline{\{\mathcal{A}\Psi_0\}}. \tag{4.5}$$

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of physical states decomposes as a direct sum of spaces $\mathcal{H}_q$ of definite charge q, called charged sectors, and the charged fields intertwine between the vacuum and the charged sectors [17]. A typical example of this structure is provided by quantum electrodynamics in the Coulomb gauge, where the electron field connects the vacuum sector to the charged sectors.

In the class of gauge theories, one can furthermore distinguish two cases.

A. **Gauge QFT of DHR type**(29) . There is a global gauge group G (a finite dimensional compact Lie group) leaving the local observables pointwise invariant, with no Gauss' law associated to the corresponding superselection rules. In this case, the charged sectors are described by *local fields* or more precisely by *local morphisms*; an example of this type would be given by a Yukawa theory of nucleon-pion interactions, in the case in which all the observables are invariant under the $SU(2)$ isospin group.

B. **Gauge QFT with Gauss' law**. The local observables are pointwise invariant under a local gauge group (an infinitely dimensional Lie group), equivalently a local Gauss law holds. In this case the charged sectors cannot be described by local fields or by local morphisms and the DHR classification and theory does not apply. A typical example is given by QED. [18]

4.2 Renormalizable Gauges And Quantum Mechanics

Since, the perturbative expansion of QED has been developped in the so called renormalizable gauges, in particular in the Feynman gauge, it is perhaps interesting to discuss the mathematical properties of such a gauge and its quantum mechanical interpretation.

---

[17] In the mathematical language they define morphisms ρ_q of the (local) observable algebra, so that a charged state representation π_q can be obtained from the vacuum representation π_0 by a morphism ρ_q: $\pi_q(\mathcal{A}) = \pi_0(\rho_q(\mathcal{A}))$. For an extensive analysis of the construction of charged states in terms of morphisms of the observable algebra see R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer 1996, esp.Ch. IV.

[18] For such a theory the delocalization of charged sectors is stronger than expected on the basis of classical electrodynamics. In fact, whereas one expects a delocalized Coulomb tail for the expectations of the electric field on a charged state, one would expect localization for the charge density $j_0(x)$ on charged states; actually, it is not so (D. Buchholz, S. Doplicher, G. Morchio, J. Roberts and F. Strocchi, Ann. Phys. **290**, 53 (2001)).

In the Feynman quantization of QED, the field algebra is generated by the *(local) fields* ψ, $\overline{\psi}$, and A_μ, and their vacuum correlation functions satisfy the relativistic spectral condition and Lorentz covariance. The field equations

$$j_\mu = \Box A_\mu = \partial^\nu F_{\nu\,\mu} + \partial_\mu \partial A \tag{4.6}$$

display the violation of Gauss' law, by the occurrence of the longitudinal field $\partial_\mu \partial A$, which cannot vanish if the electron fields are local (*weak Gauss' law*). Quite generally, one can show that the correlation functions of the fields cannot satisfy positivity and therefore there is no obvious Hilbert space structure associated to them.

The solution of this problem in the free case is well know (and discussed in any textbook on QED) and essentially due to Gupta and Bleuler (*Feynman-Gupta-Bleuler quantization*). The lesson for the general case is that the vacuum expectations $< \, >_0$ of the fields define a vector space $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{F}\,\Psi_0$, and an inner product on it by

$$< A\,\Psi_0,\, B\,\Psi_0 > \equiv < A^*\,B >_0, \;\; \forall\, A,\, B \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{4.7}$$

The subspace $\mathcal{H}' \subset \mathcal{V}$, characterized by the property of yielding vanishing expectation [19] of the longitudinal field $\partial_\mu \partial A$, is a candidate for the physical space. In fact, the validity of the Gauss' law in expectations on $\mathcal{H}'$ corresponds to the gauge invariance condition of the physical states. Furthermore, the inner product $< .,\, . >_0$ is non negative on $\mathcal{H}'$, so that $\mathcal{H}'$ has a pre-Hilbert structure and a quantum mechanical interpretation is possible.

General conditions assure that the inner product $< .,\, . >$ can be related to a Hilbert product $(.,\, .)$ on $\mathcal{V}$, by a metric operator η, with $\eta^2 = 1$,

$$< A,\, B > = (A,\, \eta B) \tag{4.8}$$

(*Hilbert-Krein structure*). The construction of η is linked to the infrared problem and physical charged states belong to the Hilbert-Krein closure of

---

[19] Such a non linear condition is replaced by a linear *supplementary condition*, which in the abelian case reads $(\partial A)^- \mathcal{H}' = 0$, with the minus denoting the destruction part of the free field operator ∂A and in the non abelian case reads $Q_{BRST}\mathcal{H}' = 0$, where Q_{BRST} is the BRST charge.

$\mathcal{V}$, i.e. can be obtained as weak limits of (local) vectors of $\mathcal{V}$; in this way, one obtains a solution of Zwanziger problem [20]

4.3 Locality, Gauss' Law and Non Regularity

In the Feynman gauge the quantization of quantum electrodynamics is obtained by adding to the gauge invariant Lagrangean a so called gauge fixing, which breaks the invariance under the full gauge group down to the subgroup of gauge transformations with gauge parameter $\Lambda(x)$ satisfying the free wave equation. Such a breaking of gauge invariance leads to the weak form of the Gauss' law. An alternative strategy, pioneered in particular by Wilson for gauge theories on a lattice, is to use a fully gauge invariant Lagrangean in the euclidean action, i.e. to avoid the introduction of a gauge fixing. In this way, the so obtained correlation functions satisfy locality, spectral condition and positivity and the Gauss' law holds in operator form. However, in such an approach to the quantization of gauge theories, the representation of the charged fields is rather peculiar, since all their correlation functions (at non coincident points), in particular the charged field propagators, vanish. This excludes a connection with the standard perturbative approach and it is actually incompatible with canonical quantization, since the so represented charged fields cannot obey canonical commutation relations.

Furthermore, in such an approach to the quantization of gauge theories, the Hilbert space defined by the so obtained correlation functions consists of the vacuum sector and the access to the charged states representations is not trivial.

A further alternative, with the purpose of keeping locality, positivity and the positivity of the energy, is the *temporal gauge quantization* [21].

The incompatibility of the Gauss' law with the canonical commutation relations of the vector potential $A_i, A_0 = 0$, which is clearly displayed in the abelian case by the equation

---

[20] For a more detailed discussion of these structures arising in the Feynman-Gupta-Bleuler formulation of QED, see Ref. 30.

[21] For a review of the literature on such a quantization, see Ref. 31.

$$[\,(divE - j_0)(y),\ divA(x)\,] = -i\Delta\delta(y-x), \tag{4.9}$$

is at the basis of the contradictory proposals, discussed in the literature, for the propagator of the vector potential, with peculiar features, like the breaking of time translations, characterizing the various solutions.

A clarification of the mathematical structure of the temporal gauge in the QED case and its compatibility with the basic quantum mechanical requirements has been discussed recently (32). In particular, one can show that the Gauss' law in operator form requires a *non regular representation* for the vector potential.

To make this point clear, it is useful to distinguish, in the mathematical structure of quantum mechanics, the algebraic properties of the canonical variables, i.e. the algebra of the canonical commutation relations (briefly the CCR algebra) and its representation in terms of Hilbert space operators.

As CCR algebra it is convenient to take the algebra $\mathcal{A}_W$ generated by the Weyl operators $U(\alpha) \sim e^{i\alpha q}$, $V(\beta) \sim e^{i\beta p}$. The use of bounded functions of the q's and p's, avoids domain questions and allows to give $\mathcal{A}_W$ a C^* algebraic structure.

A representation of the CCR algebra $\mathcal{A}_W$ in terms of Hilbert space operators is called *regular* if the (representatives of the) Weyl operators are strongly continuous in the parameters α, β. This property characterizes the standard Schroedinger quantum mechanics (of systems with finite degrees of freedom), since the q's and p's can be obtained by derivation of the Weyl operators and by the Stone-Von Neumann theorem, apart from multiplicities, there is only one regular representation. For these reasons, in the textbook presentations of the basic structure of quantum mechanics the above distinction is usually omitted.

Non regular representations have been dismissed as pathological in the past, but they are actually unavoidable for interesting physical problems, also in the case of systems with finite degrees of freedom, like the Bloch electrons and the associated θ states, the ground state representation of a quantum particle in a periodic potential, the quantum particle on a circle etc. [22] A typical example of a non regular representation is given by the state defined by the following expectations

$$< U(\alpha)\, V(\beta) >= 0, \;\; \text{if} \;\; \alpha \neq 0, \quad < V(\beta) >= 1. \tag{4.10}$$

In this representation the position operator cannot be defined (only the corresponing Weyl operator $U(\alpha)$ exists) and in fact, the common physical feature of the above mentioned quantum mechanical examples is that the ground state (wave function) is so delocalized, (as a consequence of periodic structures), that it is impossible to define the position. Non regular representation also appear in QFT models in connection with infrared singular (canonical) fields, as in the algebraic fermion bosonization, in two dimensional conformal models, in the positive quantization of the massless scalar field in two dimensions, in the positive gauge quantization of the Schwinger model, in Chern-Simons quantum field theory models (36). Also in these QFT examples, the occurrence of an infrared delocalization is responsible for the non regularity.

For the temporal gauge, its realization without violating locality, Hilbert space structure and operator Gauss' law is characterized by the following vacuum expectation, for any test function h,

$$< e^{idivA(h)} >_0 = 0, \;\; \text{if} \;\; h \neq 0, \tag{4.11}$$

where $divA(h) = \int d^4x\, divA(x)\, h(x)$. This means that the longitudinal algebra cannot be regularly represented and the correlation functions of the vector potential, in particular its propagator, do not exits (only those of its exponentials do).

---

[22] The general features of the quantum mechanics arising from non regular representations have been discussed in Ref. 33. A generalization of the Stone-Von Neumann theorem yielding a classification of the non regular representations of the CCR algebra, which are strongly measurable, has been given in Ref. 34. For the discussion of the quantum mechanical examples see Ref. 35.

In conclusion, the quantization of the temporal gauge requires a departure from the standard quantum mechanical structure, by allowing for a non regular representation of the longitudinal field algebra. [23]

4.4 Non Local Charged Fields

Finally, we shall briefly mention the basic features of quantizations of gauge theories, which keep the Gauss' law in operator form, the Hilbert space structure or positivity and allow for *non local charged fields.* This is the case of the Coulomb gauge quantization of QED.

On one side, one gets most of the nice features of a standard quantum field theory; on the other side, as mentioned before, the non locality of the charged fields is the origin of technical and conceptual problems.

The non local dynamics of the charged fields, with typical Coulomb delocalization, gives rise to a crucial dependence on the boundary terms in finite volume and on variables at infinity in the termodynamical limit, with phenomena common to gauge theories and Coulomb systems (37).

In a non perturbative constructive approach, the removal of the infrared cutoff and the renormalization is more difficult.

Particles states are described by non local fields and the standard proofs of PCT and Spin Statistics theorems do not apply.

The relation between the charge density and the electric charge becomes more delicate (38).

One may be led to think that most of the problems discussed above for the quantization of gauge theories are gauge artifacts and one should not take them seriously. As a matter of fact, they are not merely technical problems with little or even no physical relevance. They hinge on the theoretical problem of a non trivial theory which combines quantum mechanics and relativity and reflect the physical crucial fact that gauge invariance (or equivalently Gauss' law) gives rise to a strong delocalization of the (physical) charged states, so that they cannot be described by fields which satisfy local commutativity.

---

[23] A quantization of the temporal gauge in which the two point function of the vector potential exists and satisfies locality, positivity of the energy spectrum, invariance under space time translations, rotations and parity, requires a weak form of the Gauss' law and a violation of positivity; see Ref. 32.

REFERENCES

1. R. Fernandez, J. Frohlich and A.D. Sokal, *Random Walks, Critical Phenomena, and Triviality in Quantum Field Theory*, Springer 1992, esp. Sects. 1.5.1.5-6, 1.5.2.

2. F. Dyson, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 631 (1952)

3. G. Velo and A.S. Wightman eds., Proceedings of the 1977 Erice School, *Invariant Wave Equations*, Springer 1978.

4. D. Buchholz, S. Doplicher, G. Morchio. J. Roberts and F. Strocchi, *Ann. Phys.* **209**, 53 (2001), Sect. 2.

5. B. Thaller, *The Dirac equation*, Springer 1992, Sect. 4.5 and p. 307.

6. A.S. Wightman, "Invariant wave equations; general theory and applications to the external field problem," in *Invariant Wave Equations*, Erice 1977, G. Velo and A.S. Wightman eds., Springer 1978, pp.76ff .

7. L.D. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *The classical theory of fields*, Addison-Wesley 1962, Ch.III, Sect.15.

8. E.P. Wigner, "Relatistic Interaction of Classical Particles," in *Fundamental Interactions at High Energy*, Coral Gables 1969, T. Gudehus et al. eds., Gordon and Breach 1969, p.344.

9. H. van Dam and E.P. Wigner, *Phys. Rev.* **138**, B1576 (1965); **142**, 838 (1966).

10. J.A. Wheeler and R.P. Feynman, *Rev. Mod Phys.* **21**, 425 (1949).

11. D.G. Currie, T.F. Jordan and E.C.G. Sudarshan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **35**, 350 (1963), for the two particle case; H. Leutwyler, *Nuovo Cim.* **XXXVII**, 556 (1965) for the N particle case; D.G. Currie and T.F. Jordan, "Interactions in relativistic classical particle mechanics," in (Boulder) Lectures in

Theoretical Physics Vol.X-A, *Quantum Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, A.O. Barut and W.E. Brittin eds., Gordon and Breach 1968, p.91, for a general review; V.V. Molotkov and I.T. Todorov, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **79**, 111 (1981), for a proof in the constraint Hamiltonian formulation.

12. P.A.M. Dirac, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21**, 392 (1949); E.C.G. Sudarshan, "Structure of Dynamical theories," in 1961 Brandeis Summer Institute *Lectures in Theoretical Physics*, Vol.2, Benjamin 1962, esp. Sect.5, p.143; D.G. Currie, T.F. Jordan and E.C.G. Sudarshan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **35**, 350 (1963).

13. H. Ekstein, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **1**, 6 (1965).

14. W. Heisenberg, *The Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory*, Dover 1930, esp. Chap. III.

15. L.L. Landau, "On the quantum theory of fields," in *Niels Bohr and the development of Physics*, W. Pauli et al. eds. McGraw Hill, 1955.

16. R.F. Streater and A.S. Wightman, *P C T, Spin and Statistics and All That*, Benjamin 1980; R. Jost, *The General Theory of Quantized Fields*, Am. Math. Soc. 1965.

17. H. Lehmann, K. Symanzik and W. Zimmermann, *Nuovo Cim.* **1**, 1425 (1955); for excellent accounts of the LSZ theory see R. Hagedorn, *Introduction to Field Theory and Dispersion Relations*, Pergamon Press 1963 and R. Schweber, *Introduction to Relativistic Quantum Field Theory*, Harper and Row 1961, Sect. 18 b.

18. K. Hepp, "On the connection between the Wightman and the LSZ quantum field theory," in Brandeis Summer Inst. Theor. Phys. 1965, Vol.I, *Axiomatic Field theory*, M. Chretien and S. Deser eds., Gordon and Breach 1966.

19. R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics. Fields, Particles, Algebras*, Springer 1996.

20. R. Jost, *The General theory of Quantized Fields*, Am. Math. Soc. 1965, Chap. VI; A.S. Wightman, "Recent achievements of axiomatic field theory," in *Theoretical Physics*, Trieste 1962, IAEA 1963.

21. R.J. Eden, P.V. Landshoff and D.I. Olive, *The analytic S-matrix*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1966.

22. H. Araki, Ann. Phys. **11**, 260 (1960).
23. A. Martin, *Scattering Theory: Unitarity, Analyticity and Crossing* , Lecture Notes in Physics 3, Springer 1969; A. Martin, "The rigorous analyticity-unitarity program: a historical account," CERN-TH.6894/93, dedicated to the memory of Misha Polivanov.
24. K. Gawedzski and A. Kupiainen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B257**, 474 (1985). Non positive φ^4 theories have been investigated by Albeverio and collaborators, see *Comm. Math. Phys.* **184**, 509 (1997).
25. F. Strocchi, "Gauss's law in local quantum field theory," in *Field Theory, Quantization and Statistical Mechanics*, E. Tirapegui ed., In memory of B. Jouvet, D. Reidel Publ. 1981, p. 227 and F. Strocchi, *Elements of Quantum Mechanics of Infinite Systems*, World Scientific 1985, Part C, Ch. II.
26. F. Strocchi and A.S. Wightman, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **15**, 2198 (1974); A.S. Wightman, *Nuovo Cim.* **110B**, 751, (1995).
27. R. Ferrari, L.E. Picasso and F. Strocchi, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **35**, 25 (1974).
28. F. Strocchi, *Phys. Rev.* **D17**, 2010 (1978); F. Strocchi, *Selected Topics on the General Properties of Quantum Field Theory*, World Scientific 1993, esp. Ch. VI.
29. S. Doplicher, R. Haag and J. Roberts, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **13**, 1, (1969); *ibid* **15**, 173 (1969); R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, Springer 1996, Ch. IV, Sect.2.
30. G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, lectures at the Erice School on *Fundamental Problems of Gauge Field Theory*, G. Velo and A.S. Wightman eds., Plenum Press 1986; G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **44**, 5569 (2003).
31. A. Bassetto, G. Nardelli and R. Soldati, *Yang-Mills Theories in Algebraic Non-covariant Gauges*, World Scientific 1991, esp. Sect.3.3.
32. J. Loeffelholz, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Journ. Math. Phys.* **44**, 5095 (2003).
33. F. Acerbi, G. Morchio and F, Strocchi, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **34**, 899 (1993).
34. S. Cavallaro, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **47**, 307

(1999).

35. F. Acerbi, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **27**, 1 (1992); *Reports Math. Phys.* **33**, 7 (1993); J. Loeffelholz, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **35**, 251 (1995).

36. F. Acerbi, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **26**, 13 (1992); ibid. **27** 1 (1993); J. Loeffelholz, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Ann. Phys.* **250**, 367 (1996); for the Chern-Simons models see F. Nill, *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys.* B **6** 2159 (1992).

37. G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, Erice lectures 1985, loc. cit.; *Journ. Math. Phys.* **28** 622) (1987); ibid. **28** 1912 (1987); Comm. Math. Phys. **111**, 593 (1987); "Removal of the infrared cutoff, seizing of the vacuum and symmetry breaking in many body and in gauge theories," Invited talk at the *IX International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, Swansea 1988, B. Simon et al. eds., Adam Hilger 1989, p. 490.

38. G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **44**, 5569 (2003).